

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments to the claims are supported by the claims as originally filed and by the Figures. See, e.g., Figure 1 comprising two different medicament deposits, 1 and 2, on common dose bed 20. No new matter has been entered.

The prior art references applied as anticipatory of the present claims, Gavin and Trofast, do not provide the invention as claimed wherein a common dose bed is utilized. Rather, these prior art references embody the techniques described in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the specification. In this regard, the simple mixtures of Gavin are subject to the problems described at specification page 3, lines 13-24, as are the mixtures of Trofast. Even if one were to use a multi-dose inhaler described by supporting reference Haikrainen, one would be using two different dry powders separately metered and dispensed from separate powder reservoirs. In this regard, no reference cited, nor any combination thereof, would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the presently claimed invention where a metered dry powder medicinal combined dose is prepared on a common dose bed. One advantage of the present invention is that, depending on how the different powder drugs are deposited, different patterns of dose delivery, etc., may be achieved that span the range from sequential to simultaneous delivery. In this regard, the presently claimed combined dose is not a composition or a single formulation, and thus offers both regulatory and filling advantages. Because nothing in the combination of prior art discloses or suggests either the method of Claim 1 or the combined dose of Claim 10, it is submitted that the outstanding rejections are unsustainable and should be withdrawn.


The double patenting rejections made are provisional in nature. In this regard, Applicants request the Office to proceed as directed in the MPEP, and, upon reconsideration, withdraw these rejections or repeat them as necessary as actual rejections. If, as suspected, the double patenting issue is the only outstanding issue in this case preventing the allowance

Application No. 10/603,818
Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2005

of all claims, the Examiner is requested to contact the below-signed attorney, who will expedite the final resolution of this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Richard L. Treanor
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)